

9

74 / 1811

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 4TH DAY OF JUNE 1998

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE A.J.SADASHIVA

WRIT PETITION NOS.28861-62/1997

BETWEEN:

01. H.O.Parameshwarappa,
Son of Obanna, Major,
Vedavathi Nagara,
Hiriyur.

02. K.A.Periyanna,
S/o Arumugam, Major,
Vedavathi Nagara,
Hiriyur.

585

..PETITIONERS

(By Sri.Adinath Narde, adv. for petrs.)

AND:

01. The State of Karnataka,
Represented by its Secretary,
Revenue Department,
M.S.Buildings,
Bangalore-560 001.

02. The Tahsildar/Administrative Officer,
Municipal Office, Hiriyur,
Chitradurga Dist.

03. The Deputy Commissioner, Chitradurga Dist.

04. The Superintendant of Police,
Chitradurga Dist.

05. A.Erappa,
Son of Mundappa,
aged about 50 years.

06. H.Ramanna,
Son of Hanumanthappa,
aged about 50 years.

07. T. Thyaramallaiah,
Son of Thyarappa,
aged about 62 years.

08. Rangalakshmi,
W/o Dri. Jagannath,
aged about 38 years,

09. B.Jeenithunnisa Begum,
W/o Mohammed Ghouse,
aged about 44 years.

Respondents 5 to 9 are all residing at
Vedavathinagara, Hiriya.

..RESPONDENTS

(By Sri. K.Nagaraja, HCGP for R1, R3 and R4;
Sri. N.Devadas, Adv for R2; Sri.L.Govindaraj,
Adv. for R5 to R8)

This Memorandum of Writ Petition is filed
under Articles 226 & 227 of the Constitution of
India, praying to quash the notices at Annexure-F
& G dated 21.06.1997 passed by the second respondent
bearing No.PURASABHA (2) AAR:97-98; to direct the
respondents 1 to 4 not to interfere with the
peaceful possession and enjoyment of the property
in Sy.No.155 and 156 of Vedavathi Nagara, Hiriya
Taluk; and to review/recall the order passed by
this court in W.P.NO.22879/93 decided on 19.12.96.

Read: Order dt. 11th day of Feb. 1998 for disposing of the W.Ps.

I.A.I for Extension of Time:

The learned Govt. Adv. has filed an application with an affidavit in the disposed of W.P. praying that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to extend the time by another 2 months for the reasons stated therein.

I.A.I is coming on for Orders this day, the Court made the following:-

ORDER

I.A.I is misconceived as no order has been made against the applicants while disposing of the petition. The notice issued by the applicant was challenged by the petitioners and once the petition is disposed of, the petitioners cannot have any grievance against the respondents. It is for the respondents to take action in accordance with law. I.A.I is, accordingly, rejected.

s/- JUDGE.

klb.

r.ova/2.ova
24/6/98

Copy

